



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,856	10/07/2003	Mikimasa Matsui	MAEDA.001AUS	5817
7590	04/07/2006		EXAMINER	
MURAMATSU & ASSOCIATES Suite 310 114 Pacifica Irvine, CA 92618			MUSSER, BARBARA J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1733	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/680,856	MATSUI, MIKIMASA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Barbara J. Musser	1733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 6 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/17/06</u>. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
--	--

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Tolinski(U.S. Patent 6,824,206), Mercer et al.(U.S. Patent 4,435,902), any of Adams et al., Phelps, and Friedman, and Mailander et al.(U.S. Patent 5,678,879)

The admitted prior art discloses forming a sunshade by pressing a resin plate to a desired shape and cutting it, attaching a sheet to one side of the shaped member so that one end of the sheet extends outward of the shaped member, and wrapping the extended end of the sheet around the end of the shaped member.([0003]-[0005]) The admitted prior art does not disclose what the resin plate is made of. Tolinski discloses that the resin plate used in sunshades is conventionally made of polypropylene reinforced with fiberglass.(Col. 3, ll. 5-16) Tolinski also discloses the sheet can be bonded to the resin plate during the molding process, but does not disclose any details.(Col. 3, ll. 61-62) The admitted prior art does not disclose cutting the resin plate to shape using an ultra-high water jet cutting machine. Mercer et al. discloses using ultra high pressure water jet cutting machines to cut fiberglass resin composite since this process results in very little waste and almost no dust.(Col. 1, ll. 55-66; Col. 2, ll. 11-

12) The admitted prior art does not disclose pressure forming the resin plate and sheet to shape and bond them together at the same time. Adams et al.(Figure), Phelps(Figures 3-4A), and Friedman(Figures 1 and 2) disclose it is well-known in the molding arts to shape and bond a base and sheet at the same time. The references cited above do not disclose how the wrapping of the extended end of the sheet is performed or how the sheet is bonded to the resin plate. One in the art would appreciate that a device of some sort would be used to bend the extended portion and that such bending would occur via the application of pressure to the extended portion. Mailander et al. discloses that in sunvisors, the sheet is conventionally welded to the substrate via ultrasonic welding.(Col. 1, II. 5-10)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the resin plate from polypropylene reinforced with fiberglass since using such materials in sunshades is well-known and conventional in the arts as shown for example by Tolinski(Col. 3, II. 5-17), to cut the resin plate using an ultra-high pressure water jet cutter since Mercer et al. discloses such devices can cut fiber reinforced resin composites creating only a very small amount of waste while creating almost no dust(Col. 1, II. 55-66; Col. 2, II. 11-12), to shape the resin plate at the same time it is bonded to the sheet since this is well-known and conventional in general in the molding arts as shown for example by Adams et al.(Figure), Phelps(Figures 3-4A), and Friedman(Figures 1 and 2) and since Tolinski implies that the resin plate is bonded to the sheet when the sheet is molded(Col. 3, II. 61-62), and to use a device to fold the extended portion of the sheet since applying pressure with a device is well-

known in general, and to bond the extended end of the sheet to the resin plate via ultrasonic welding since using an ultrasonic welder to bond to sheet to a substrate in the sunvisor arts is well-known as shown for example by Mailander et al.(Col. 1, ll. 5-10). While the admitted prior art discloses pressing prior to cutting the resin plate to shape, one in the art would appreciate that since the plate is molded and bonded to the sheet at the same time, the plate would have to be cut to the desired shape prior to molding and bonding so that it would fit correctly with the sheet. While the references do not disclose trimming the sheet and shaped member, it is well-known in general to trim articles to the final desired size after processing, and it would have been obvious to perform final trimming on the sheet and shaped member to remove excess material since using materials slightly bigger than the desired end product allows for slight variations in placement of the sheet and resin plate relative to one another and insures that the final product is not smaller than it is intended to be and to cut the sides of the sheet which are not intended to be extended past the resin plate flush with the sides of the resin plate since Tolinski shows the sheet and plate can be cut flush(Figures 4 and 5, Col. 4, ll. 6-7), particularly since these sides would not be seen when the sunshade was in use.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, bending of a sheet around a soft material conventionally presses the lower edge inward so it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the bottom edge of the resin plate longer so that when the sheet is bent around it, the pressure of the bending forces the front to be flat rather than sloped.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, the admitted prior art discloses an adhesive sheet between the sheet and the shaped resin plate.[0005]

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1/17/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument that the references do not disclose an ultra-high pressure water jet cutting device, Mercer et al. does.

Regarding applicant's argument that the references do not disclose the resin plate being made of polypropylene with fiberglass reinforcement, Tolinski shows such.

Regarding applicant's argument that the references do not disclose cutting before shaping, one in the art would appreciate that since the plate is molded and bonded to the sheet at the same time, the plate would have to be cut to the desired shape prior to molding and bonding so that it would fit correctly with the sheet.

Regarding applicant's argument that the references do not disclose using a finishing tool to bend the extended edge via pressure, one in the art would appreciate that a device of some sort would be used to bend the extended portion and that such bending would occur via the application of pressure to the extended portion since applying pressure to bend via a device is well-known in general as a method of bending.

Regarding applicant's argument that the references do not disclose an ultrasonic welding device which welds the sheet to the resin plate, Mailander et al. does.

Regarding applicant's argument that the references do not disclose the ends of the sheet and resin plate being flush, Tolinski discloses such.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara J. Musser whose telephone number is (571) 272-1222. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday; alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571)-272-1226. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



BJM



SAM CHUAN YAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER